

REMARKS

Claims 1-51 are the claims currently pending in the present Application.
Independent claim 37 is amended to clarify features recited thereby.

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 25, 30, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41 and 43 as being dependent from rejected base claims, but stated that claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 25, 30, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41 and 43 would be allowable if rewritten as independent claims.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 21, 29, 37, 40, 47 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Zanchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,814,798. This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that of providing an appropriate font or language to a wireless client, such as a mobile communication device, without imposing substantial additional burdens on the wireless client or on an information source server that is providing information to the wireless client. According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, a gateway server connecting the wireless data communication network of the wireless client with the internet protocol network of the information source server, or an intermediary server connected to the gateway server, determines a font to be used in the wireless client according to a data reception state of the wireless client, or provides an appropriate font to the wireless client or sends information to the wireless client.

For at least the following reasons, the cited references, including Zanchi, neither anticipate nor render obvious Applicant's claimed invention. By way of example, independent claim 1 requires that the gateway server send the information data to the wireless client according to a data reception state of the wireless client concerned with the determined font.

Zanchi discloses selecting and managing personal preference attributes used in an Application device (Zanchi, Abstract). Zanchi discloses that: (1) a personal application device, such as a cellular telephone, is connected via the world wide web to a computer which stores attribute information including font data (Zanchi, Fig. 7; col. 4, lines 14-53); and (2) a portable memory card or widely accessible database may also store and provide user preferences or user attributes data.

Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway server that connects a wireless client with an information source server, such that the gateway server sends the information data to the wireless client according to a data reception state of the wireless client concerned with the determined font, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 1. That is, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway that when sending data to a wireless client sends the data according to a wireless client's data reception state concerned with the determined font.

The Examiner alleges that the gateway server is inherent in an application in which the wireless client is connected to an internet server. However, merely because some sort of processor connecting a wireless network with an IP network may be necessary, it does not follow that a gateway server that provides the functions provided by the gateway server required by Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1 is disclosed or

suggested. For example, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway server that sends data according to a wireless client's data reception state concerned with the determined font, as required by claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 12, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest at the gateway server determining a font used in the wireless client.

Further, with respect to independent claim 21, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway server that is notified by a wireless client of the language used.

Moreover, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway server that determines a font to be used in the wireless client as, *inter alia*, required by independent claim 29.

Independent claim 37 requires a user control server connected to the wireless client and the information source server via the gateway server. Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a user control server connected in such a way. Since Zanchi does not disclose or suggest such a user control server, Zanchi is incapable of disclosing or suggesting that such a user control server determines a font to be used in the wireless client, as further required by claim 37.

With respect to independent claim 47, this claim requires a font server connected to a gateway server, the gateway server connecting a wireless client with an information source server. Since Zanchi does not disclose or suggest such a font server, Zanchi is incapable of disclosing such a font server which also stores a font used to represent the information data in the wireless client, as further required by claim 47.

Finally, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest at the gateway server determining a font used in the wireless client to output the information data, as required, *inter alia*, by independent claim 51.

Therefore, Zanchi does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37, 47 and 51. In fact, Zanchi belongs to the prior art recognized by Applicant's disclosure, because Zanchi does not disclose or suggest a gateway server that relieves the wireless client and the information source server of the burdens on processing, memory or system resources associated with determining a font or language to be used in the wireless client or with providing an appropriate font or language to the wireless client. Similarly, in connection with independent claim 37 and 47, Zanchi belongs to the prior art because Zanchi does not disclose a user control server or a font server connected to the gateway server that relieves the wireless client and the information source server of the burdens on processing, memory and system resources above-discussed.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1, claim 16 depends from independent claim 12, and claim 40 depends from independent claim 37. Therefore claims 5, 16 and 40 incorporate the novel and non-obvious features of their respective base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Rejection of Claims 3, 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being obvious from Zanchi and Kovacs et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0003191. This rejection is traversed.

Kovacs was filed in the United States on December 1, 2000. The present Application was filed in the United States on October 19, 2000. Therefore, Kovacs does not qualify as prior art under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Further, Kovacs does not cure the deficiencies of Zanchi as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove Kovacs as prior art against the present Application.

Claims 3, 14 and 22 depend from independent claim 1, 12 and 21, respectively. Therefore claims 3, 14 and 22 incorporate the novel and non-obvious features of their respective base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Rejection of Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46, and 48-50

under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-29, 34-36, 44-46, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being obvious from Zanchi. This rejection is traversed.

Claims 9-11 depend from independent claim 1, claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 12, claims 26-28 depend from independent claim 21, claim 34-36 depend from independent claim 29, claim 44-46 depend from independent claim 37, and

claims 48-50 depend from independent claim 47. Therefore these dependent claims incorporate the novel and non-obvious features of their respective base claims. As discussed, independent claims 1, 12, 21, 29, 37 and 47 are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious from Zanchi. Therefore, claims 9-11, 18-20, 26-28, 34-36, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that the respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Rejection of Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being obvious from Zanchi and Simon, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,008. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1, claims 23 and 24 depend from independent claim 21, claim 32 depends from independent claim 29, and claim 42 depends from independent claim 37. Therefore, claims 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 incorporate the novel and non-obvious features of their respective base claims.

Simon does not remedy the deficiencies of Zanchi as they relate to Applicant's claimed invention. Simon discloses a secure font subset distribution (Simon, Abstract). In particular, Simon discloses a font server that creates fonts and provides them to the user.

Simon does not disclose or suggest the above-recited features of the independent claims. Accordingly, claim 7, 23, 24, 32 and 42 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment of the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:eg